

The Washington Department of Ecology is working on Safer Products for Washington cycle 1.5, which focuses on products identified in our [2021 PFAS Chemical Action Plan](#).¹ We held a webinar on August 10, 2023, to present research and preliminary regulatory determinations and seek input from stakeholders.

This document outlines questions attendees asked, as well as answers the Safer Products for Washington team provided, during the webinar held on August 10, 2023. We edited some of our answers for conciseness and clarity. Our responses reflect where we are in the research process and may change as we learn more from our research and stakeholders.

At the end of this document, you'll find resources shared in chat during the webinar. Find more information about Safer Products for Washington on the [stakeholder webpage](#).² If you have additional questions, please contact us at SaferProductsWA@ecy.wa.gov.

Questions and Answers

Q: Is this session being recorded?

A: We're not recording this webinar. We'll post updated webinar slides with the on-screen notes after the webinar.

Q: I joined this call late. Will this PowerPoint be distributed to us afterwards?

A: The PowerPoint is available now: [Safer Products for Washington Cycle 1.5 PFAS Chemical Action Plan Implementation Cycle](#)

Q: What was the decision criteria for defining PFAS differently than the EPA definition?

A: The Washington State Legislature defined PFAS in [RCW 70A.350.010](#).³ It is the same definition used in other Washington State statutes regulating PFAS.

Q: When you are referring to PFAS as a class in these slides, are you referring to them by use as you mentioned earlier? Example: PFAS used in carwashes?

A: We're referring the statutory definition of PFAS, which groups them into a chemical class, not by function or product use.

Q: Assuming Ecology moves forward restricting the use of many forms of PFAS in many different uses, we would then assume a reduction in exposure and release of PFAS to the environment. But is Ecology planning to actually validate reductions in exposure and release of PFAS through any sort of testing? In other words, will we look to see if there are fewer PFAS in our water, air, soil, and bodies?

A: As part of Ecology's persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) monitoring program, our Environmental Assessment Program monitors PFAS in our Washington State environment over time. The actions that we take in regulating PFAS in consumer products are part of many actions

¹ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2104048.html>

² https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1962/37555/safer_products_for_washington.aspx

³ <https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=70A.350.010>

that have been taken in our state, country, and world. We don't work in a vacuum. We do hope that we'll see reductions to PFAS over time, but those reductions would likely be the results of many actions.

Q: How about non-bioaccumulative and nontoxic PFAS?

A: Not all PFAS bioaccumulate, which is why we use transparent criteria that balances data gaps and the information we have. What we've learned from the data that we have on PFAS is that even PFAS that don't bioaccumulate are persistent or toxic, which means they don't meet our criteria for safer.

Q: Market analysis issues: These might be too early in the process for you to address, but nevertheless I'm wondering:

- 1. Equity Impacts (highly captured markets/rural/low income/testing access)?**
- 2. Internet/out-of-state purchases (your global estimates perhaps?)**
- 3. Grandfathered manufacturers/shelf life?**

A: These are great things to consider. We're in the preliminary stage of our market analysis and primarily focused on availability of alternatives safer, feasible alternatives. Are they affordable for the consumer (price comparison), and what will the affects in the market be? If there are cheaper, safer alternatives that are available, it's much easier for transition. There will be different effects of those impacts, depending on the consumer's economic status. We are also trying to consider manufacturers, inside and outside Washington, and all the markets here. These are great points to consider.

Q: Are you also considering the financial costs of not acting to reduce exposure (e.g., costs for cleaning up ground water and drinking water contamination in Washington State or health impacts of exposure to PFAS)?

A: Right now, our market analysis is focused on availability of alternatives, price, and ease of transitioning. As part of the rulemaking process, we do a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis. At that time, we will cover health benefits and overall benefits as part of our cost benefit analysis.

Q: Re: Substitute chemicals: How does Washington define "high concerns for carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, reproductive or developmental toxicity, or endocrine disruption"? "High toxicity in other ways and very persistent, bioaccumulate toxic"? Is this definition in the statute or regulation?

A: These definitions are from our [2022 Regulatory Determinations Report](https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/summarypages/2204018.html),⁴ Appendix C. They are described in detail and align with GreenScreen® for Safer Chemicals and the Global Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS).

Q: Referencing "Whether a restriction would reduce a significant source or use." Does this go beyond a simple aggregate total and consider that significant exposures can occur to subpopulations, such as workers, hobbyists, etc.? Significant exposures may not occur to everyone, but they may be significant

⁴ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/summarypages/2204018.html>

to certain subpopulations of individuals.

A: Absolutely, we do consider the importance of exposure in subpopulations. It's not a whole population risk assessment. We look at who's most impacted. We took this approach during Safer Products for Washington cycle 1. Phthalates were no longer used in some products, but they were still being used in other products like vinyl flooring. So, for people who purchased those vinyl flooring products, it was still a significant source of exposure.

Q: Are you saying that you are only proposing a reporting requirement for cookware for now and delaying alternatives assessment, or as your final regulatory action?

A: At this point in time, we're proposing a reporting requirement for cookware for cycle 1.5. These are preliminary regulatory determinations. The point of us sharing all this information is to get your input and thoughts. We do change direction based on stakeholder participation. That regulatory determination won't be final until after the end of the 2025 legislative session. Our report will be complete in June 2024, and then it sits with our Legislature until the end of the 2025 session.

Q: Regarding filling data gaps: If it's difficult to collect ingredient information on certain products and if PFAS could be used in the product in theory, then based on the precautionary principle would it not make sense to prohibit PFAS in that product class? PFAS may be added in the future so prohibit it now makes sense. If the companies selling these products aren't sharing data, then prohibiting the product should coax them to cooperate.

A: Our authority under Safer Products for Washington statute means that we cannot propose a restriction unless we have determined that alternatives are safer and available. One of the challenges we're having is determining which chemicals are being used instead of PFAS; without this information, we're not able to determine if the alternatives already in use are safer. We have found some chemical alternatives and are currently evaluating those with hazard assessment.

Q: Based on what you see, is PFAS manufacturing dominated by a few companies, so that trade secrets will control innovation?

A: In regard to patent searches and patent analysis, I have looked at several patents. We're still evaluating engineered options to see if those alternative solutions are feasible and available. More research is needed. In regard to your big question, the trade secret issue has definitely hindered at least some of the assessment of this particular product category. You may not necessarily get some of the full-blown disclosure that you see in California ingredient disclosures, but sometimes there is information in patents.

Q: Does "in process" mean that alternatives are in process-or that your evaluation of alternatives are in process?

A: It means our evaluation is in process. In a lot of places, we know there are alternatives already on the market. However, we need to show those alternatives are safer, feasible, and available. If we know something's PFAS free, we know there's an alternative that's feasible and available. But then we need to know whether that alternative is also safer. So, our evaluation is in process.

Q: Given the level of variability as you discussed within the class of PFAS, will all 12,000 PFAS chemicals in the class be restricted, or will specific chemicals be identified as appropriate?

A: We approach PFAS as a class based on definition in our statute, which groups all PFAS together in one class. In our previous our previous rule, which was adopted in May 2023, we regulated PFAS as a class in specific uses and products. So while the chemical class is broad, regulatory actions focus on specific products. We assess PFAS as a class by evaluating the data rich chemicals in the class and comparing them to our criteria for safer. This analysis can be found in our 2022 regulatory determinations report to the legislature.

Q: The difluoroethane (C₂H₄F₂) chemical structure is not a PFAS per Washington's definition. It does not have one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

A: That particular chemical is out of scope for this product category.

Comment: I appreciate Ecology's measured and rules-based approach, certainly to avoid litigation over interstate commerce restrictions, instead of what might feel like a hasty reaction to non-evidence-based restrictions. Besides, as noted, not working in a vacuum, your work will inform federal action.

Q: What does the term "gear" mean in regard to Safer Products? Second question: How does Ecology interact with data collection at Ecology?

A: So, we're about to address the first part of your question in the next section. Regarding your second question: I'm not entirely sure what type of data collection you're referring to. We do have a product testing program, and we stay in touch with them. We also do a lot of work with manufacturers and through voluntary outreach. We work both upstream and downstream with manufacturers as much as they're willing.

Follow-up question: Are you doing any PFAS research?

A: We do not have any PFAS product testing work related to this research underway.

Follow-up question: Is there a definition for "apparel"? Does that include footwear and accessories (e.g., hats, gloves, etc.)?

A: Subcategories of apparel and gear currently under consideration include: Active and sportswear, outdoor wear (including professional), formal wear, everyday wear, work wear, accessories, gear (including backpacks and bags), and footwear. If there are other definitions or additional subcategories to consider, we would appreciate your input.

Q: What about alternatives for medical wear?

A: We did look at medical wear as part of work wear and, as I'm sure you can surmise, the same issue persists. Medical PPE has to be protective against a broad spectrum of different liquids (biological fluids are a mixture of water and fat and other liquids). In this case, we didn't find any feasible or available alternatives that could provide the protection in medical PPE.

Q: Have you looked at children's wear or infant products?

A: Children's products are included in our work in apparel and gear. We also have the Children's Safe Products Act (CSPA), which requires reporting on two PFAS. This is summarized in our chemical action plan. We've noticed a reduction in those two PFAS over time, but we aren't sure whether they've been replaced by other PFAS.

Comment: The industry would likely disagree from a customer perspective that activewear and sportswear do not need water and stain resistance. This chemical class is highly pervasive and used in more products than one might think.

A: We'd be very happy to hear about any specific products or companies that are using PFAS and feel that it's needed, from the customer perspective.

A: You mentioned active wear and sportswear in your comment. Are those comments related to that?

Follow-up comment: Absolutely. Having said that and noting that there are industrial challenges with oil and stain resistance, all you have to do is hop onto either Blueign's® library of approved chemistry or OEKO-Tex's® institute, and you can see what PFAS-free alternatives they have vetted and approved for use under their certifications.

Q: Did I understand correctly that there were indeed safer, feasible, and available (SFA) alternatives identified for apparel? Can you please clarify why your preliminary findings for apparel do not involve restrictions?

A: We did find safer, feasible, alternatives for some applications within apparel, but we didn't find safer, feasible, alternatives that we think work across the entirety of this product category.

In Cycle 1, we did break cycle product categories apart for drink cans but not food cans, for example. But in this cycle, is abbreviated so the next rulemaking will happen sooner than the gap between cycles 1 and 2. We haven't broken product categories apart in our regulatory rulemaking process, just because it seems like that's going to get super weedy to do multiple rulemaking processes at the same time. Waiting and keeping product categories together seems like the right option. Again, this is preliminary, so feel free to share your thoughts on that approach.

Q: I am still not clear on gear. So, what wasn't mentioned in this PowerPoint was tents. In this one, it said day packs. If you go to a store like REI, there's lots of different gear made out of a fabric-like material. I didn't hear that described. How are you defining your universe of gear in this context?

A: Our working definition encompasses the function and the types of apparel and gear that's listed on the slides. We largely base this on data in the CAP. We can go back to the CAP, and this is a preliminary webinar. If you're suggesting we expand to other types of gear, we're happy to look into that.

Follow-up question: Could we use a definition like "products that are used for outdoor recreation that are made out of textile-type things"?

A: If you have a suggestion for a definition, we're always interested in hearing and considering suggestions.

Follow-up comment: The noun "gear" refers to several things. It's the equipment we need for a sport or event.

Q: Do the categories include sweat-resistant workout gear that is not necessarily for outdoors?

A: We did look at these types of products. We considered them in our active wear and athleisure

subcategories for apparel.

Comment: It would not make sense to use PFAS in sweat wicking activewear because PFAS repel water, but in order to achieve wicking, fabrics need to absorb water. Essentially, if you used PFAS on these products, they would not wick sweat well. Cross contamination is always a concern.

Comment: We have heard from brands and manufactures that they were able to move away from PFAS with reliable alternatives. We are happy to share more information if helpful.

Q: I think textiles are a great category because we've seen so many successes in industry, and we're willing to support you in any way we can to take action on that category.

A: Thank you.

Comment: Thanks to Justin for this incredible work on identifying alternatives. They're used in so many different places, and I know it's a big challenge to look at all those different applications. I think you've made a huge amount of progress. On work wear, I would encourage you to look carefully at what performance requirements really are. You mentioned mechanics, and my dad wore coveralls every day. They were dark colored; I don't think they were meant to wash out clean. They protected clothes underneath. I know you use things like cleanability, and for something like medical gear, maybe we need to. And firefighters – maybe there are other performance requirements, but I think for a lot of work wear you can find other alternatives. And then for the breaking the category apart topic, I know you haven't made a final decision, and I would just encourage you to really strongly consider taking action where you can as soon as possible because these are unnecessary exposures — not necessary for the user or for communities where PFAS are being produced and where products are being disposed of. The sooner we can get rid of these chemicals, the sooner we can protect people from exposures.

Q: The International Association of Firefighters (IAFF) are looking at alternatives to PFAS in the middle layer (and filing a lawsuit against the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) regarding the standard, since Gore is part of the committee that sets the standard). Has, or could, the Washington Department of Ecology be in contact with the IAFF?

A: We actually did meet with some members of the IAFF and a few other folks who are experts on firefighting PPE, and they were very helpful. They gave us an initial overview of types of firefighter PPE, and of course you might be familiar with work they've done (not just on the Legislative aspect). They've also helped with different studies. So, yes, we have been in contact, and they were very helpful in getting our initial work up and running.

Q: The Nantucket deputy fire captain has been in touch with the manufacturer of the PPE that has a PFAS-free middle layer. My sense was that the manufacturer was doing its own testing prior to releasing to market. Would possibly connecting with the Nantucket firefighters help in connecting to the manufacturer?

A: Thank you for that information. We can potentially reach out to the Nantucket group, but we do have a connection with the manufacturer of the alternative moisture barrier. We have tried reaching out to them, but they have not responded just yet. Connecting with the Nantucket firefighters might be a good idea, especially if they have someone to connect us to, so thank you.

Q: Nantucket firefighters in Massachusetts have been told that one manufacturer (of the two

manufacturers) of middle layer of fighting gear is working on an alternative.

A: We have identified the manufacturer who is currently advertising that they have a non-PFAS compliant product for firefighter PPE. Engagement is planned, and hopefully we'll get the information we need to include this alternative in our determinations for this regulatory cycle.

Comment: PFAS is not required in firefighter gear in Washington State, but there are currently no or limited options for PFAS-free firefighting gear.

Q: In your product categories, are you covering food packaging materials? These are a direct exposure concern (and add to landfills). Is Ecology working on testing and removing PFAS packaging materials from the supply chain?

A: PFAS in food packaging was included in our CAP; however, the Legislature addresses it in a separate statute and we're already working on alternatives and implementing restrictions.

Q: Are printing equipment, including toners and inks, exempt?

A: These are not currently priority products and are out of scope of this work. Safer Products for Washington works on identifying chemicals, then products, then determinations. In this cycle we're focusing on the products we showed at beginning of this presentation on slide 12 (firefighter PPE, apparel and gear, car waxes, etc.) – so not printing equipment. In future cycles we could look at these products, but we would first need to identify them as significant sources or uses as priority chemicals and that process includes a public comment period.

Q: Can you discuss alternatives to gaskets and rings?

A: Those are usually made with Polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), and at this point, we have not found any safer alternatives for mechanically treated PTFE.

Q. Is Ecology looking at the issue of PFAS from fluorinated plastic containers? It will potentially affect the products if they are in containers that are fluorinated.

A: That is not currently a priority product for this cycle 1.5; however, Safer Products for Washington is cyclical and that could become a product later. We're always interested in hearing ideas from stakeholders. Our work has really been focused on products in the Chemical Action Plan and not plastic containers, but we know that can be a source. Thank you for sharing.

Q: Is there a need to inform the public about older furniture, pillows, children's pajamas, etc. to remove some home exposures?

A: This is a little out of the scope of Safer Products for Washington but not out of the scope of Ecology. We do work on education and outreach in addition to our regulatory work in Ecology. (Please see the [Washington Recycles](http://1800recycle.wa.gov/),⁵ [Toxic chemicals in your home](https://ecology.wa.gov/waste-toxics/community-waste-toxics/at-home),⁶ and [Healthy home guide](https://ecology.wa.gov/Waste-Toxics/Community-waste-toxics/At-home/Healthy-home-guide)⁷ webpages for more information.)

⁵ <http://1800recycle.wa.gov/>

⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/waste-toxics/community-waste-toxics/at-home>

⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Waste-Toxics/Community-waste-toxics/At-home/Healthy-home-guide>

Q: I have always worried about PFAS in Tyvek® "building wraps." I now see new building wraps in use that do not list any PFAS in their ingredients. Building wraps are in wide use, and scraps often go to the dump. Is this being studied?

A: Great consideration. This is not currently included in products covered in this webinar, but as you know, Safer Products for Washington is a cyclical process and we're in a constant state of updating our research. We'll consider this moving forward.

Q: Is PFAS in furniture and carpets already phased out?

A: Furniture and carpets were cycle 1 priority products, and they are in the rule we adopted in May of this year. Earlier, we put a link to the new rule in the chat. That's why we're not focused on furniture and carpets in this cycle.

Q: Will there be any discussion on cosmetics?

A: The Washington Toxics Free Cosmetics Act passed last legislative session and restricts PFAS in cosmetics. Since it's already been addressed by the legislature, we are not addressing PFAS in cosmetics under safer products. Our agenda today does not include information about the Toxic-Free Cosmetics Act. If you have questions about the Toxic Free Cosmetics Act, you're welcome to reach out to us.

Comment: I'm an ecologist at an on-site wastewater treatment plant. I've been doing this so long. I see the extinction rate in aquatic ecosystems happening at a much higher rate than other taxa. For the most part, we know the immune systems of organisms are being hampered by upstream pollutants. I feel like this is morally reprehensible, and the precautionary principle can help us avoid this. Then I notice the soil is far superior for bioremediation. If we're going to have toxics coming down drains, our wastewater treatment plants are simply not prepared, engineered, or designed for these chemicals. Good soil is amazing at microbially activating these long-chain hydrocarbons. Here in California, on-site laundry grey water does not require a permit from the state. So, to me, it seems like a no-brainer that we should be aggressively recommending using soil as a bioremediation tool, rather than our highly vulnerable aquatic ecosystems.

A: At Ecology, we have lots of different ways that we approach protecting people and the environment. In the Safer Products for Washington program, we focus on pollution prevention by getting chemicals out of products, so they don't need to be treated later. I will pass your comments along to the PFAS CAP implementation team. So, thank you very much for your comment.

A: There are two noticeable trends: Extinction of aquatic life happening at a faster rate due to upstream pollution and using soil as a bioremediation material.

Q: Is waste treatment through landfill management and wastewater treatment systems effective to reduce the environmental risks of PFAS to safer levels?

A: There have been improvements in treating PFAS in waste; however, when we go back to the pollution prevention hierarchy, we want to focus on reducing sources, so we don't have to treat them later. So, our focus is on pollution prevention.

Q: Ecology has identified safer alternatives but has not given any reporting requirements. Is this because

you are still investigating?

A: We've found safer alternatives for some types of cleaning products, but we're still looking at others. We didn't want to break up product categories because this work is being done so close to the other Safer Products for Washington cycles and rulemakings. We don't have data to say that certain chemicals are safer alternatives in each of those individual product categories. We want to make sure that alternatives are safer, feasible and available for the overall category of cleaning products in and of itself.

Q: Why are PFAS propellants out of scope for the cleaning product category?

A: At this time, we're discussing the function of PFAS as surfactants in cleaning products. We may be able to look at alternative propellants in the future, but with the time that we have for cycle 1.5 work, we are focusing on cleaning agents.

Follow-up comment: Propellants seem like a much higher priority issue.

A: We'll consider that input.

Q: Would cleaning agents include disinfectants and sanitizers, since many are cleaners and disinfectants?

A: Our focus is on PFAS used as surfactants in cleaning products, and disinfectants and sanitizers can fall into this product category.

Q: Paraffin wax is a known concern when it comes to other products like candles. It is interesting to see it used as an alternative. Is this simply because compared to PFAS it is, okay?

A: We're still in the process of evaluating paraffin wax by hazard assessment. Don't know whether it is a safer alternative, yet. We approach safer as less hazardous than an existing chemical or process. In this case, we want to know whether it's safer than PFAS.

Q: Could you please say more about why the proposal is for a reporting requirement for ski wax and auto wax and polish but there is no action for floor wax and polish?

A: We're still at the preliminary stage of evaluating some of those alternatives for safer. With floor waxes, preliminary work shows we might be able to identify safer alternatives with more time. In cases where we expect to have enough information to complete our evaluation of safer, feasible, and available alternatives in next couple of years, we proposed continuing research. In cases where we were unsure if PFAS were still in use in that particular product and we our work was limited by transparency, we proposed a reporting requirement.

Q: For ski wax, have you considered that Vermont has already banned PFAS as of this summer?

A: We consider regulatory actions by other states and actions. Even if a chemical has been banned elsewhere but could still in use in Washington, we have to show that there are safer, available, and feasible alternatives. The Vermont ban tells us that alternatives are feasible and available, but without knowing what's in the alternative ski waxes, we don't know whether they are safer and cannot propose a restriction.

Q: Why are waxes and polishes that come on cars already out of scope?

A: In that case, the waxes and polishes are part of the car and cars are exempt in our statute.

Q: Do the alternative assessments for floor polishes and finishes include physical safety implications of the dried film (e.g., in terms of how alternative chemicals affect slip resistance of the coating to ensure safe pedestrian transit on the surfaces)?

A: In our assessment we separate hazard and performance evaluations. We are looking at chemical hazard assessments to determine whether the alternative is less hazardous than PFAS. In the feasibility assessment, we would consider with performance attributes (e.g., Is it going to be as slip resistant?). We are still waiting on some of the chemical assessments.

Q: It seems contradictory to separate the two specific uses in this category [waxes and finishes] but not to separate uses in other categories like apparel — especially when there are apparel categories for which there are safer alternatives already available and on the market.

A: Floor waxes, automobile waxes, and ski waxes are all separate types of products, versus cleaning products are considered one product type in our CAP.

Q: Did you consider flooring that does not require waxing or polishing?

A: That is definitely an alternative, but it's not an alternative for people who already have flooring in their buildings. That alternative is feasible and available for some cases, but it's not going to be for every application.

Follow-up question: What about performance standards regarding flooring? Is less polishing and waxing an option? Does the floor have to be that shiny?

A: We typically begin our feasibility assessment by looking at products already on the market that meet the same needs. We'll ascertain chemical hazards, and then we can consider into performance requirements of products already on the market.

Follow-up question: I guess what I'm asking is less polishing okay?

A: By and large, we look at alternatives that are already in use. So, I think we'd look at whether that practice is in use. Are people doing that, does it work, does it meet performance needs? Pulling an example from a previous report, we learned that some companies just stopped treating their furniture, and it still met their performance needs. So, we can do that, but we want evidence that people are already changing their practices or doing something like that. The regulatory determinations options are restriction, reporting, or no requirements, so putting a frequency or limit on that wouldn't necessarily be something that would fit within regulatory requirements, but we could address this as part of our outreach efforts.

Q: Given how much information has come out since the PFAS CAP, including the number of PFAS in existence and products they are in, are there any things that would help Ecology accelerate the processes of Safer Products for Washington? Separately I'd like to recommend that Ecology accelerate

the processes of Safer Products for Washington. I'd like to recommend that Ecology consider products that were not known when the CAP was drafted, such as extruded plastics and building products (e.g., artificial decking and turf).

A: For this cycle 1.5, we are limited to what was in our CAP; however, that's not an ongoing limitation. That's just the way this amendment was written, to give us an additional cycle to help address PFAS in consumer products. Moving forward, we are not limited to what's in the CAP. So, when we move on to Cycle 2, we can work on this broader pool. You're right, there has been so much work done since that CAP.

Comment: I just want to encourage you to look and see. I get not making regulatory determinations, but the longer we wait on some of these product categories, the more PFAS enters our environment. I just want to highlight taking action when and whenever possible.

Q: What is the timeline for cycle 2, or where can I find this timeline?

A: See slide 53 in our presentation on Cycle 2, [Safer Products for Washington: Draft Priority Chemicals for Cycle 2](#).⁸

⁸ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2304038.html>

Resources

Below is a list of resources shared during the August 10, 2023, Safer Products for Washington cycle 1.5 webinar.

- [August 10, 2023, webinar slides \(updated\)⁹](#)
- [2021 PFAS Chemical Action Plan¹⁰](#)
- [2023 Cycle 2 Phase 1 Draft Priority Chemicals Report¹¹](#)
- [June 2023 webinar on Cycle 2 Phase 1 Draft Priority Chemicals Report¹²](#)
- [Safer Products for Washington adopted rule¹³](#)
- [2022 Cycle 1 Phase 3 Regulatory Determinations Report to the Legislature¹⁴](#)
- [Pollution Prevention for Healthy People and Puget Sound Act¹⁵](#)
- [Safer Products for Washington stakeholder webpage¹⁶](#)
- [Ecology's PFAS in food packaging webpage¹⁷](#)

9

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/Documents/saferproducts/August2023_PFASCycle_Presentation_Update_d.pdf

¹⁰ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2104048.html>

¹¹ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2304038.html>

12

https://www.ezview.wa.gov/Portals/_1962/Documents/saferproducts/June%202023_Cycle2%20Phase%201_Presentation_Revised.pdf

¹³ <https://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-337>

¹⁴ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2204018.html>

¹⁵ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1904012.html>

¹⁶ https://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias_1962/37555/safer_products_for_washington.aspx

¹⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/waste-toxics/reducing-toxic-chemicals/addressing-priority-toxic-chemicals/pfas/food-packaging>